DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 181 UD 033 112

AUTHOR	Padi-Sandamela, Ambition; Maddahian, Ebrahim
TITLE	School Readiness Language Development Program: A Teacher Survey Report. Publication No. 701, Part C.
INSTITUTION	Los Angeles Unified School District, CA.
PUB DATE	1999-08-00
NOTE	42p.; Cover page gives publication date as June 1999.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Early Childhood Education; *Language Acquisition; Minority Groups; *Parent Participation; Preschool Children; *Preschool Teachers; Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; School Desegregation; *School Readiness; Tables (Data); *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Los Angeles Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

The School Readiness Language Development Program (SRLDP) is one of several programs developed in response to a court order to racially integrate the Los Angeles Unified School District (California). The program, developed for schools with high proportions of minority students, includes oral language development opportunities for 4 year-olds, a payment education component to enhance parenting skills, and staff development. Teachers were surveyed about the effectiveness of the program on their students' achievement. This summary presents results of the teacher survey, completed by 119 teachers from 88 schools. Most SRLDP teachers have solid teaching experience. Overall, they are highly satisfied with the workshops provided for staff development and very satisfied with the instructional program components they use in their programs. More than half of the teachers used literature, poetry, stories, and journals for all students, and more than half used oral language and English-as-a-Second-Language activities. A major obstacle teachers encountered was the lack of cooperation from parents. A small minority of teachers were overwhelmed by mandated reports and concerned about the lack of administrative support at the school site. Other major obstacles were the lack of classroom centers and convenient bathroom facilities. Recommendations are made for program continuation and improvement. Appendixes contain the tables and the teacher survey. (Contains 14 tables.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 434 181

SCHOOL READINESS LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: A TEACHER SURVEY REPORT

Publication No. 701, Part C
June 1999

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ebrahim Maddahian

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Prepared by
Ambition Padi Sandamela, M.Ed.
Ebrahim Maddahian, PhD.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESEARCH BRANCH

UD 033112

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCHOOL READINESS LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: A TEACHER SURVEY REPORT

Publication No. 701, Part C
August 1999

Prepared by
Ambition Padi-Sandamela, M.Ed.
Ebrahim Maddahian, Ph.D.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESEARCH BRANCH

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ruben Zacarias
Superintendent

APPROVED:

Ted Bartell, Ph.D.
Director
Program Evaluation and Research Branch

August 1999

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was commissioned by the office of Student Integration Services of the Los Angeles Unified School District to investigate the implementation of School Readiness Language Development Program (SRLDP) on an ongoing basis. The authors of this manuscript gratefully acknowledge the support and assistance of the participatory evaluation committee whose assistance with this evaluation report was indispensable. The evaluation committee members are:

Theodore T. Alexander, Jr., Assistant Superintendent

Lucinda Aguilar, Adviser
Modesta Bassity, Coordinator
Grace Bohannon, Teacher
Hattie Coatney, Adviser
Clare Frederick, Parent Educator
Nancy Robins, Adviser
Ynez Gilmer, Parent Educator
Akiko Hiraga, Adviser
Linda Kim, Administrator
Christine Martin, Teacher
Carolyn Okuno, Adviser

The authors also thank all principals and teachers at schools with SRLDP who participated in this study. This evaluation would have been impossible without their contribution. We also thank our clerical staff, especially April Watson, and Christina Simpson, for their time and effort. Finally, we especially acknowledge the support and help received from Akiko Hiraga, William Renfroe, and Elena Loredo Velarde, in editing this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Content	Page
Acknowledgments	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	v
Executive Summary (Part C)	vi
Introduction	1
Study Methods	2
Study Results	3
Summary of Findings	8
Conclusions and Recommendations	9
Appendices	
Appendix A: Tables	11
Appendix B: Teacher Survey	26

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Responding Teachers From Participating Schools	12
2	Years Taught by Responding Teacher	13
3	Years as SRLDP Teacher	14
4	SRLDP Teachers' Certifications	15
5	Students Being Taught per Program	16
6	Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students	17
7	Non-Fluent English Speaking Students	18
8	Paraprofessionals and Average Work Hours per Week	19
9	Effectiveness of Staff Development Workshops	20
10	Major Obstacles Encountered While Teaching SRLDP	21
11	Instructional Program Components That Impact Students' Achievement	22
12	Instructional Program Components that Impact LEP Students' Achievement	23
13	Instructional Program Components that Impact Non-LEP Students' Achievement Who are Not Fluent English Speakers	24
14	Innovative Instructional Approaches Recommended for SRLDP	25

SCHOOL READINESS LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
1997-98 EVALUATION: A TEACHER OUTCOMES STUDY

Executive Summary (Part C)

Background

In 1970, the Los Angeles Superior Court ruled that the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) operated segregated schools and rendered the initial order to integrate LAUSD schools. LAUSD was required to take "reasonable and feasible" steps to alleviate the harms of segregation.

The Court requested that LAUSD identify methods to help ameliorate the four harms of racial isolation which included: low academic achievement, low self-esteem, lack of access to post-secondary opportunities, and interracial hostility and intolerance. Subsequently, the Court added overcrowded conditions as the fifth harm. The Court mandated that LAUSD actively promote student integration.

School Readiness Language Development Program (SRLDP) is one of several programs developed in response to the original Court order for schools that were racially isolated which were redesignated as Predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian and Other Non-Anglo (PHBAO). This program includes the following components:

- Oral language development opportunities for 4-year old students by developing social/emotional, cognitive, physical skills and abilities necessary for success and progress in our school system
- A payment education component to enhance the development of parenting skills essential to a child's development
- A staff development component to provide training for SRLDP teachers to

increase their knowledge and skills for the developmental processes of prekindergarten students

Evaluation Componenets

This evaluation is part of a comprehensive, participatory project designed by an evaluation committee comprised of SRLDP administrators, teachers, parent educators, program staff, and evaluators. The evaluation includes three components:

- Impact of the program on current and former student achievement outcomes (Part A)
- Nature of parent education instruction provided to parents and parents' opinions of provided services (Part B)
- Nature of presented staff development and teachers' opinions about services provided (Part C)

Purposes

The main objectives of this part of the evaluation (Part C) are:

1. To review services provided to SRLDP teachers.
2. To review teachers' opinions of provided services.
3. To examine the nature of staff development provided to teachers.
4. To review the extent to which SRLDP was implemented.

Findings

This part of the evaluation examines the opinions of teachers regarding the effectiveness of the program on their students' achievement. This summary presents the results of the teacher's survey on:

- teacher background, such as certification and teaching experiences
- instructional components that impact students' achievement

- teachers' assistants and their impact on helping students
- problems encountered while teaching in the program

This report is a continuation of the previously published studies, "School Readiness Language Development Program Evaluation: A Student Outcomes Study (Part A)" and "School Readiness Language Development Program Evaluation: A Parent Outcomes Study (Part B)." The results of this evaluation (Part C) indicate that:

- The majority of teachers in SRLDP have solid teaching experiences with bilingual credentials. Most teachers possess the Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC) certificate.
- There are more bilingual aides than any other aides in SRLDP. These aides are also the most helpful in the classroom because they can communicate with students and parents in their primary (home) language.
- Overall, teachers were highly satisfied with the workshops provided for staff development. Workshops provided which teachers rated the most effective are the math, music, literature, and the print-rich environment workshops.
- Teachers were very satisfied with the instructional program components they were using in their programs. These programs positively impacted all student populations in the program.
- More than half of the teachers used literature, poetry, stories and journals for all students.
- More than half of the teachers used oral language and ESL activities for LEP students.
- About two-thirds of the teachers used oral language and ESL activities for

students who were non-LEP but who were not fluent English speakers.

- One of the major obstacles encountered by some teachers was the lack of cooperation from parents. Teachers expressed frustration about some parents' lack of involvement in their children's school activities, while other parents were too enthusiastic and as a result, did homework for their children.
- A small minority group of teachers were overwhelmed with mandated reports, and were concerned about the lack of additional administrative support at the school site.
- Other major obstacles encountered by a small group of teachers were the lack of classroom centers and bathroom facilities conveniently located for easy access.

Recommendations

The following are recommended as a result of this study:

- It is recommended that school administrations encourage parents to actively participate in their children's school activities and homework. Parents should be encouraged to volunteer and keep their appointments. Further, parents have to be reminded about the importance of punctuality, so that they drop off and pick up their children on time.
- School administrators should offer additional help and support to SRLDP teachers, teacher assistants and substitutes. This will boost their morale and inspire them to work even harder.
- The staff development component for SRLDP teachers and paraprofessionals should continue and possibly include some of the topics suggested by teachers, such as creative curriculum, team-teaching approach, parent participation and writers'

workshops.

- The District should provide adequate and conveniently located classroom and bathroom facilities.

Introduction

Background

The School Readiness Language Development Program (SRLDP) is a comprehensive early childhood developmental program that provides instruction for prekindergarten students to enhance their listening, speaking, using a wide range vocabulary, and experiencing academic readiness skills necessary to succeed in school. SRLDP not only focuses on students and their parents, but also on educators (i.e., teachers, parent educators, and paraeducators) by providing staff development to enhance their knowledge of early childhood development.

SRLDP is part of the Los Angeles Unified School District's (LAUSD) Integrated Educational Excellence Plan Through Choice. It addresses three of the five major consequences of racial isolation that were identified as harmful by the Court in Crawford vs. Los Angeles Board of Education (1976): low self-esteem, low academic achievement, and interracial hostility and racial intolerance.

SRLDP is designed for prekindergarten children who live within the school boundaries of Predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian and Other Non-Anglo (PHBAO) schools with a greater than 70% combined minority population. All 4-year old children who live within the schools' attendance areas are eligible to participate. Enrollment is limited to 30 pupils per program. Schools may have more than one program if they have enough children and available space. Children must be 4 years old by December 2nd of the year in which they enroll.

Teacher Education Component

At the beginning of each year orientation meetings are provided for all new SRLDP teachers and newly assigned principals to schools with SRLDP. Mandatory central staff development meetings are conducted annually for all SRLDP teachers and paraprofessionals. Other meetings

are also provided as needs occur. The objectives of this portion of the evaluation are to review services provided to SRLDP teachers and to examine teachers' opinions of those services.

Study Methods

A brief description of the selected sample is presented with a review of the teacher survey, data collection process, and an explanation of the methods used to analyze the collected survey data.

Selected Sample

Based on school location, ethnic distribution and school's number of programs, a stratified random sample of 116 schools was selected from a total of 305 schools with 516 programs in 1997-98. A total of 119 teachers from 88 schools responded to the teacher survey. This survey questionnaire was designed to elicit the following information:

- Years of teaching experiences
- Years teaching as a SRLDP teacher
- Type of bilingual certification earned
- Students in each program
- Limited-English Proficient (LEP) students in each program
- Non-LEP students who are not fluent English speakers in the program
- Instructional program components that mostly impact students' achievement
- Instructional program components that mostly impact LEP students' achievement
- Instructional program components that mostly impact non-LEP students' achievement who are not fluent English speakers

- Type of paraprofessionals and hours worked per week
- Major obstacles encountered while teaching SRLDP students
- Importance of paraprofessionals in helping students
- Effectiveness of staff development workshops
- Other innovative instructional approaches that teachers would like to recommend

Appendix A contains a list of all tables.

Appendix B contains a copy of the teacher evaluation survey. Survey questionnaires were distributed to teachers at their school sites. Teachers sent completed surveys to the Program Evaluation and Research Branch office for coding, processing and analyses. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and present the findings.

Study Results

Who Participated in this Study?

Table 1 presents a list of 87 schools and the number of teachers and percentage from each school who participated in this study. Table 2 presents years of teaching experience of the 119 participating teachers. Their teaching experience ranges from 1 to 41 years with an average of 20.2 years. Overall, 19.7% have taught for ten years or less, 50% of the teachers have taught for 20 years or more, and 85% have taught for more than 30 years. This data indicates that the majority of teachers in SRLDP are on a permanent basis, and have adequate experiences.

Table 3 indicates that more than 50% of the respondents have been SRLDP teachers for four years or more, and only 15.3% of SRLDP teachers have been in the program for one year. Overall, the average years of teaching as SRLDP teachers is 5.4 years.

Table 4 indicates that 33.6% of the teachers in this study possess a Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC), 9.2% have a Language Development Specialist Certificate (LDS), and 6.7% possess either a Specialist Instruction in Bilingual Cross-Cultural Education (SIBCE), a Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language & Academic Development (BCLAD), a Cross-Cultural Language & Academic Development (CLAD), or an A-Level Certificate respectively. However, 30.3% of the participants did not provide information about their language certification.

Students Being Taught

According to participants, the number of students enrolled in the program ranged from 20 to 31. Table 5 shows that 75% of the teachers have 30 students as required by the program, 15 in the morning and another 15 in the afternoon. The average number of students in a program is 29.

Table 6 indicates that only 1% of the participants indicated that they did not have Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in their program. About one-sixth (15.8%) said they have 30 LEP students, and 9.9% said they have more than 10 LEP students in their classrooms. For this sample, the overall average number of LEP students in a program is 21 students per program.

Participants were also asked to indicate the number of non-LEP students who are not fluent English speakers in their programs. Although about two-thirds (20.2%) of the survey participants did not respond to this question, 36% indicated that they did not have non-LEP students who are not fluent English speakers in their programs, and 20.2% indicated that they had less than 10 students in their programs (see Table 7).

Table 8 indicates that teachers have at least one paraprofessional in their classrooms. Among the 119 teachers, 83.2% have bilingual teacher assistants who work an average 25.7 hours per week, 26.1% have education aides who work an average 17.8 hours per week, and 5% have other bilingual aides who work an average 18.7 hours per week.

When teachers were asked to specify which assistants were important in helping students, 85.7% cited teacher bilingual aides, 26.9% cited education aides, and 4.2% cited other bilingual aides.

Effectiveness of Staff Development Workshops

Participants were highly satisfied with the effectiveness of the instructional workshops that were provided for staff development. As indicated in Table 9, the overall ratings of the staff development workshops were above the score average of 5, indicating a positive attitude toward their contribution to increase staff knowledge and expertise. Of all staff development workshops cited (on a 10-point scale, 10 being the most effective), participants were mostly pleased with the math, music and literature workshop with an average rating of 8.4, followed by print-rich environment (8.3), exhibits (8.1), music and movement (8.1), and music and poetry (7.9). Although the American Indian Education workshop also had an above average rating, teachers rated this workshop lower than others (6.4).

Major Obstacles Encountered While Teaching SRLDP Students

As presented in Table 10, the content of teacher comments indicates that 34.5% of the teachers experienced problems with parents who did not cooperate with the guidelines of SRLDP. More than one-fifth (23.5%) of the teachers stated that parents did not either fulfill and/or understand their responsibilities. The major complaints were getting children to school and picking them up from school on time (some parents pick up their children very late in the afternoon), and assisting children with their homework. Some parents committed to volunteering, but did not arrive for their scheduled time. Some teachers expressed concerns

about some parents who did homework for their children, and others who neither helped nor encouraged their children to do their homework.

Also, 20.2% of the teachers stated that a lack of adequate and appropriate facilities was a major problem. ,Some teachers shared classrooms, which increased their susceptibility to noise distraction caused by other students in the same room. Some were concerned about the lack of conveniently located bathroom facilities and learning centers.

As stated in Table 10, a small minority of teachers (4.2%) expressed concerns and frustration about the lack of administrative support. Most of these teachers indicated that the administration at their school sites gave them more responsibilities without offering them additional assistance.

Also, 4.2% of the teachers expressed concerns about the availability of paraprofessionals and/or substitute teachers. Some indicated that their principals utilized paraprofessionals to perform other duties outside the classroom, and others felt that some teachers and administrators did not positively reinforce and acknowledge the work of paraprofessional substitutes. This, teachers believed, lowered the paraprofessionals' and substitutes' morale.

Finally, 4.2% of the teachers stated that they had too much mandatory paperwork to deal with. These teachers stated that too much paperwork cost them effective planning and teaching time.

A small group of teachers (1.7%) indicated that they were unable to communicate with parents due to a language barrier. As a result, teachers who spoke English only could not communicate effectively with them and/or their children who are non-English speakers.

Instructional Program Components that Impact Students' Achievement

Table 11 presents teachers' judgement about the impact of the program components on their students. More than half of the teachers (51.3%) stated that the use of literature, poetry, stories and journals in their instructional programs had the most impact on their students' achievement. Another 39.5% indicated that implementing oral language development (including ESL) in their instructional programs impacted their students' achievement, and 30.3% stated that music and movement programs had the most impact on their students' achievement. Less than 1% of the teachers indicated that teaching reading was the least effective program component that impacted students' achievement.

Instructional Program Components that Impact LEP Students' Achievement

Table 12 shows that about half of the teachers (50.4%) stated that oral language and ESL activities had the most impact on their LEP students' achievement. Other program components that were cited by teachers as very effective for all SRLDP students are music and movement (43.6%), literature, poems and stories (40.3%), and parent participation (28.3%). Furthermore, 14.3% of the teachers stated that having access to activity centers had an impact on students' achievement. Teachers indicated that the availability and proximity of learning centers allowed them to be creative, and students were encouraged to learn and be active in the classroom. Teachers also indicated that having bilingual teacher assistants in their classrooms helped to improve students' achievement (13.4%). Other program components that have been proven effective were hands-on-activities/homework (11.2%), interaction of LEP students with fluent English speakers (9.2%), math and manipulatives (9.2%), and field trips (8.4%).

Instructional Program Components that Impact on Non-LEP Students who were not Fluent (mainstream) English Speakers

When asked about instructional program components that impacted non-LEP students who were not fluent English speakers, 18.5% of the teachers cited oral language, ESL and language arts. About 15.1% cited music, and another 15.1% cited literature, stories and poems, as more effective instructional program components. Furthermore, 6.7% of the teachers cited parent participation, 5.0% cited small group instruction, and another 5% cited drama (see Table 13).

Innovative Instructional Approaches Recommended for the SRLDP

Although a majority (76.5%) of respondents failed to cite strategies they have implemented in their programs, the data analysis shows that overall SRLDP teachers are using a variety of instructional strategies they would like to be part of the professional standards. Table 14 shows that of those who responded, 5.9% implemented creative curriculum, 4.2% used a team-teaching approach, 3.4% used parent participation, 2.5% used writers' workshops, 1.7% used alphabet activities, another 1.7% used Proficiency in English Program (PEP), and another 1.7% used zoo units.

Summary of Findings

- This study indicates that the majority of teachers in SRLDP have solid teaching experiences with bilingual credentials. Most teachers possess the Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC) certificate.
- There are more bilingual aides than any other aides in the SRLDP. These aides are also the most helpful in the classroom because they can communicate with students and parents in their primary (home) language.

- Overall, teachers were highly satisfied with the workshops provided for staff development. The most effective workshops rated by teachers are math, music and literature, and print-rich environment workshops.
- Teachers were very satisfied with the instructional program components they were using in their programs. These programs positively impacted all student populations in the program.
- More than half of the teachers used literature, poetry, stories and journals for all students.
- More than half of the teachers used oral language and ESL activities for LEP students.
- About two-thirds of the teachers used oral language and ESL activities for students who were non-LEP who were not fluent English speakers.
- One of the major obstacles encountered by some teachers was the lack of cooperation from parents. Teachers expressed frustration about some parents' lack of involvement in their children's school activities, while other parents were too enthusiastic and as a result, did homework for their children.
- A minority group of teachers were overwhelmed with mandated reports, and were concerned about the lack of additional administrative support.
- Other obstacles encountered by a small group of teachers were the lack of activity centers and bathroom facilities conveniently located.

Recommendations

As a result of these findings in this study, the following are recommended:

- School administrators should encourage parents to actively participate in their

children's school activities and homework. Parents should be encouraged to volunteer and keep their appointments. Further, parents have to be reminded about the importance of punctuality, so that they drop off and pick up their children on time.

- School administrators should offer additional help and support to SRLDP teachers, teacher assistants, education aides and substitutes. This will boost their morale and inspire them to work even harder.
- The staff development program component for SRLDP administrators, teachers and paraprofessionals should continue and possibly include some of the topics suggested by teachers, such as creative curriculum, team-teaching approach, parent participation and writers' workshop.
- The school district should provide adequate and conveniently located classroom and bathroom facilities.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Table 1.
Responding Teachers From Participating Schools

School	n	%	School	n	%
102nd St.	2	1.7	Kester	1	. 8
112th St.	1	. 8	King	2	1.7
15th St.	1	. 8	Limerick	2	1.7
186th St.	2	1.7	Liggett	1	. 8
61st St.	2	1.7	Loreto	2	1.7
93rd St.	1	. 8	Los Angeles	1	. 8
96th St.	1	. 8	Maclay Primary	1	. 8
Albion	1	. 8	Manhattan	1	. 8
Allesandro	2	1.7	Marvin	2	1.7
Arco Iris	1	. 8	Menlo	2	1.7
Ascot	1	. 8	Middleton	2	1.7
Baldwin	1	. 8	Miramonte	2	1.7
Barton Hill	2	1.7	Montara	1	. 8
Bertrand	1	. 8	Napa	1	. 8
Brainard	1	. 8	Nevin	1	. 8
Bridge	1	. 8	Normandie	1	. 8
Budlong	2	1.7	Osceola	1	. 8
Burton	1	. 8	Parmelee	1	. 8
Camellia	2	1.7	Playa del Rey	1	. 8
Canoga Park	2	1.7	Purche	1	. 8
Cantara	1	. 8	Roscoe	1	. 8
Caroldale	1	. 8	Rowan	2	1.7
Catskill	2	1.7	San Fernando	1	. 8
Century Park	2	1.7	San Miguel	2	1.7
Chapman	1	. 8	Saturn	2	1.7
Coliseum	1	. 8	Selma	1	. 8
Corona	1	. 8	Shenandoah	1	. 8
Dayton Heights	1	. 8	Shirley	1	. 8
Delevan	1	. 8	Soto	1	. 8
Dolores	1	1.7	Stanford	2	1.7
Eastman	1	. 8	Stoner	2	1.7
El Sereno	1	. 8	Sunny Brae	1	. 8
Fair	1	. 8	Sylmar	1	. 8
Flournoy	1	. 8	Toland Way	1	. 8
Ford	2	1.7	Utah	2	1.7
Gates	1	. 8	Van Nuys	3	2.5
Glen Alta	1	. 8	Virginia Road	1	. 8
Grand View	2	1.7	Walnut Park	2	1.7
Halldale	1	. 8	Weigand	1	. 8
Hammel	2	1.7	Wilmington Park	1	. 8
Hawaiian	2	1.7	Woodcrest	2	1.7
Hillside	1	. 8	Woodlawn	1	.8
Hughes	1	. 8			
Hyde Park	1	. 8	Total	119	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2.
Years Taught by Responding Teachers

Number of Years Taught	n	%	Cumulative %
1	1	0.9	0.9
2	1	0.9	1.7
3	2	1.7	3.4
4	3	2.6	6.0
5	1	0.9	6.8
6	1	0.9	7.7
7	1	0.9	8.5
8	5	4.3	12.8
9	4	3.4	16.2
10	4	3.4	19.7
11	3	2.6	22.2
12	7	6.0	28.2
13	2	1.7	29.9
14	3	2.6	32.5
15	3	2.6	35.0
16	1	0.9	35.9
17	5	4.3	40.2
18	3	2.6	42.7
19	1	0.9	43.6
20	8	6.8	50.4
21	2	1.7	52.1
22	4	3.4	55.6
23	2	1.7	57.3
24	4	3.4	60.7
25	7	6.0	66.7
26	3	2.6	69.2
27	3	2.6	71.8
28	4	3.4	75.2
29	3	2.6	77.8
30	9	7.7	85.5
31	3	2.6	88.0
32	5	4.3	92.3
33	3	2.6	94.9
34	1	0.9	95.7
35	2	1.7	97.4
37	1	0.9	98.3
38	1	0.9	99.1
41	1	0.8	100.0
Total	117	100.0	

Note. Average number of years of teaching is 20.2.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3.
Years as SRLDP Teacher

Years as SRLDP Teacher	n	%	Cumulative %
1	18	15.2	15.2
2	16	13.4	28.6
3	17	14.3	42.9
4	10	8.4	51.3
5	13	10.9	62.2
6	6	5.0	67.2
7	8	6.7	73.9
8	4	3.4	77.3
9	7	5.9	83.2
10	7	5.9	89.1
11	2	1.7	90.8
12	1	0.8	91.6
13	1	0.8	92.4
14	3	2.5	94.9
16	1	0.8	95.7
17	4	3.4	99.1
Unknown	1	0.8	100.0
Total	119	100.0	

Note: Average number of years of teaching as SRLDP teacher is 5.4 years.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4.
SRLDP Teachers' Certifications

Type of Certification	n	%
Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC)	40	33.6
Language Development Specialist (LDS)	11	9.2
Specialist Instruction in Bilingual Cross-Cultural Education (SIBCE)	8	6.7
Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language & Academic Development (BCLAD)	8	6.7
Cross-Cultural Language & Academic Development (CLAD)	8	6.7
A-Level Certificate	8	6.7
Unknown	36	30.3
Total	119	100.0

Table 5.
Students Being Taught per Program

Number of Students Being Taught	Number of Responding Teachers	%
20	1	0.8
25	1	0.8
26	1	0.8
27	6	5.1
28	6	5.1
29	13	11.0
30	89	75.4
31	1	0.8
Unknown	1	0.8
Total	119	100.0

Note. The average number of students in a program is 29.

Table 6.
Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

Number of LEP Students	Number of Responding Teachers	%
0	1	1.0
2	1	1.0
4	1	1.0
5	2	2.0
6	2	2.0
10	4	3.4
11	1	1.0
12	2	2.0
13	2	2.0
14	4	4.0
15	6	5.9
16	4	4.0
17	1	1.0
18	4	4.0
19	4	4.0
20	10	9.9
21	3	3.0
22	2	2.0
23	6	5.9
24	4	4.0
25	6	5.9
26	2	2.0
27	5	5.0
28	7	6.9
29	1	1.0
30	16	15.8

Note. The average number of LEP students in a program is 21.

Table 7.
Non-LEP Students Who are Not Fluent English Speakers

Number of Non-LEP Students Who are Not Fluent English Speakers	Number of Responding Teachers	%
0	43	36.0
1	8	6.7
2	7	5.9
3	7	5.9
4	5	4.2
5	2	1.7
6	1	0.8
7	1	0.8
8	1	0.8
9	1	0.8
10	2	1.7
12	5	4.2
15	1	0.8
17	2	1.7
18	1	0.8
20	3	2.5
21	1	0.8
24	1	0.8
28	1	0.8
30	2	1.7
Unknown	24	20.2
Total	119	100.0

Table 8.
Paraprofessionals and Average Work Hours per Week

Type of Assistants	Number of Responding Teachers	%	Avg. Work Hours/week
Bilingual Teacher Assistant	99	83.2	25.7
Education Aide	31	26.1	17.8
Other Bilingual Aides	7	5.0	18.7
Total	137	100.0	

Note. This is a multiple response item. Some teachers have more than one aide in their classroom.

Table 9.
Effectiveness of Staff Development Workshops

Workshops	N	Avg. Rating
Math, Music and Literature	114	8.4
Print-Rich Environment	117	8.3
Exhibits	115	8.1
Music and Movement	116	8.1
Music and Poetry	114	7.9
Magic Puppets	115	7.7
Home School Connection	112	7.6
Let's Go Places	111	7.4
American Indian Education	113	6.4

Note. The effectiveness average scale is based on a 10-point scale, with one being the least effective and 10 being the most effective.

Table 10.
Major Obstacles Encountered While Teaching SRLDP Students

Obstacles	n	%
Lack of parental cooperation and commitment	41	34.5
Parental responsibilities	28	23.5
Lack of facilities	24	20.2
Lack of administrative support	5	4.2
Availability of teacher assistants and substitutes	5	4.2
Too much paperwork	5	4.2
Inability to communicate with parents	2	1.7
Students speak little or no English	2	1.7

Table 11.
Instructional Program Components that Most Impact Students' Achievement

Program Component	n	%
Literature, poetry, stories, and journals	61	51.3
Oral language development and ESL	47	39.5
Music and movement	36	30.3
Parent participation	34	28.6
Learning centers	21	18.5
Field trips	19	16.6
Math and manipulatives	17	14.3
Psychomotor activities	17	14.3
Social and emotional/peer support	15	12.6
Creative curriculum	14	12.2
Smaller class size	11	9.2
Budget to purchase materials	11	9.2
Outdoor activities	10	8.4
Parent workshops and education	9	8.0
Thematic teaching units, including PEEK	8	7.2
Staff development	8	7.2
Art	8	7.2
Take home library program	7	6.8
Daily reading aloud	7	6.8
Science	7	6.8
Hands-on activities	7	6.8
Directed lessons	6	5.0
Availability and reinforcement of paraprofessionals	6	5.0
Instructional lessons	4	3.4
Indoor activities	4	3.4
Small group instruction	3	3.2
Circle time/stay time	3	3.2
Structured environment	2	1.7
Teaching reading	1	0.8

Table 12.
Instructional Program Components that Impact LEP Students' Achievement

Program Component	n	%
Oral language and ESL activities	60	50.4
Music and movement	51	43.6
Literature, poems and stories	48	40.3
Parent participation	33	28.3
Learning centers	17	14.3
Availability and reinforcement of bilingual paraprofessionals	16	13.4
Hands-on activities/homework	13	11.2
Interaction with fluent English speakers	11	9.2
Math and manipulatives	11	9.2
Field trips	10	8.4
Shared reading and reading aloud	9	7.6
Primary language instruction	8	6.7
Instructional lesson	8	6.7
Psychomotor	8	6.7
Circle time	8	6.7
Parent education	7	6.8
Smaller class size	7	6.8
Outdoor activities	7	6.8
Games	5	4.2
Drama and/or acting	5	4.2
Nutrition and hygiene	5	4.2
Social skills, positive reinforcement	5	4.2
Print-rich environment, visuals	5	4.2
Take home library	4	3.4
Self-directed lessons and activities	4	3.4
Social Studies	3	2.5
Creative curriculum	3	2.5
Budget for purchasing materials	3	2.5
Staff development	2	1.7
Physical education	2	1.7
Language modeling	2	1.7
Sheltered English	1	0.8

Table 13.
Instructional Program Components that Impact Non-LEP Students' Achievement Who are Not Fluent English Speakers

Program Component	N	%
Oral language, language arts and ESL	22	18.5
Music	18	15.1
Literature, stories and poems	18	15.1
Parent participation	8	6.7
Small group instruction and activities	6	5.0
Drama	6	5.0
Art	4	3.4
Learning centers	3	2.5
Teacher aides	3	2.5
Read aloud	2	2.0
Visuals, print-rich environment	2	2.0
Manipulatives	2	2.0

Table 14.
Innovative Instructional Approaches Recommended for SRLDP

Instructional Approach	n	%
Creative curriculum	7	5.9
Team-teaching approach	5	4.2
Parent participation	4	3.4
Writers' workshop	3	2.5
Alphabet activities	2	1.7
Proficiency in English Program	2	1.7
Zoo units	2	1.7
Field trips	1	0.8
Thematic units for nutrition time	1	0.8
Scholastic Rocket Charts throughout curriculum	1	0.8
Unknown	91	76.5
Total	119	100.0

APPENDIX B

TEACHER SURVEY

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Program Evaluation and Research Branch
&
Office of Student Integration Services

May 27, 1997

Dear SRLDP Teacher:

We are in the process of evaluating some of the District's integration programs, including the School Readiness Language Development Program, and the impacts of these programs on student outcomes. Your honest feedback is vital to our evaluation. Please complete the attached survey by June 20, and return it through school mail to the given address at the lower portion of this page.

Thank you for your participation in the evaluation of the SRLDP.

Please fold the survey in two and send it to the following address :

Ebrahim Maddahian
Program Evaluation and Research Branch — Room 9
8810 Emerson Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90045

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch
&
Office of Student Integration Services

School Readiness Language Development Program (SRLDP)
Teacher Evaluation Survey, 1996-97

1. School _____ Location Code_____

2. Name (Optional)_____

3. No. of years taught_____ No. of years taught as a SRLDP teacher_____

4. What type of bilingual certification do you possess? _____

5. How many students are you teaching?_____

6. Which parts of your instructional program have the most impact on your students' achievement ?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

   e. _____

7. Briefly describe the major obstacles you have encountered while teaching SRLDP students.

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

   e. _____

8. How many of your students are Limited English Proficient (LEP)? _____

9. How many of your non-LEP students are **not** fluent English speakers?_____

10. Which parts of your instructional program have the most impact on your LEP students' achievement?

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

e. _____

11. Which parts of your instructional program have the most impact on the achievement of your non-LEP students who are not fluent English speakers?

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

e. _____

12. Which of the following individuals are assisting you and for how many hours?

Education Aide (EA) ___ Yes ___ No ___

If 'Yes', how many hours per week? ___

Teacher Bilingual Assistant (TA) ___ Yes ___ No ___

If 'Yes', how many hours per week? ___

Other Bilingual Aides ___ Yes ___ No ___

If 'Yes', how many hours per week? ___

13. How important is the function of your paraprofessional in helping your students?

(Please check)

Paraprofessional	Not Applicable*	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
Education Aide				
Teacher Bilingual Aide				
Other Bilingual Aide				

- I do not have a paraprofessional assisting me.

14. On a scale of one to ten (ten being the most effective, one being not effective at all), please rate the level of effectiveness of the following staff development workshops.

(Please rate all that apply.)

Music and Movement _____
Home School Connection _____
Math, Music and Literature _____
Music and Poetry _____
Print Rich Environment _____
American Indian Education _____
Let's Go Places - Music About Travel for Little Ones _____
Magic of Puppets _____
Exhibits _____

15. Are you using any innovative instructional approaches that you would like to be included in the SRLDP? If 'yes', please give a brief description of your ideas.

_____

_____

_____